A STUDY
IN ENGLISH METRICS
BY
MYRA REYNOLDS

A STUDY
IN ENGLISH METRICS

BY ADELAIDE CRAPSEY

VERSE
A STUDY IN ENGLISH METRICS

A STUDY
IN ENGLISH METRICS

By

ADELAIDE CRAPSEY

New York
ALFRED A. KNOPF
MCMXVIII

AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE

It is hoped that the study here presented may prove of value not only to professional students of metrics but to all who are seriously interested in poetry. It forms only one part, in itself complete, of an investigation of certain problems in verse structure the full carrying out of which was prevented by Miss Crapsey's death in the autumn of 1914. An indication of what remained to do may be found in the note appended to the essay. The tables printed as *Additional Analysis* present a portion of the data which had been collected for a second part of the study.

To any one who reads to the end, it must be evident, that Miss Crapsey regarded the use of exact measurement and analysis—which probably is denoted as the application of phonetics to metrics?—as essential to the "finer and righter" appreciation of poetry; that she considered a full awareness of technique the necessary equipment of one who would understand fully the subtle and delicate beauty of verse. This is a position that

has long been won in regard to music; no one would attempt to be a critic of musical composition who was unaware of the technical problems of musical construction. Is it not likely that the criticism of poetry may become far more significant when our literary critics consider necessary a corresponding equipment? At least it may be stated that the laborious analysis was in Miss Crapsey's case dictated by an acute sense of the beauty of verse, by an æsthetic experience of unusual intensity. To one who knew her and watched her work Miss Crapsey's untimely death seems to have brought about a double frustration; it prevented the completion of the study in prosody and the undertaking, which that study would so much have enriched, of a series of essays in criticism. That a scientific knowledge of the technique of verse may be a potent tool in the hand of the poet also will probably at once occur to the readers of Miss Crapsey's verse.

<div style="text-align: right">E. L.</div>

SYNOPSIS

MAIN THESIS

That an important application of phonetics to *e*
metrical problems lies in the study of phonetic
word-structure.

SUB-THESIS UNDER PRESENT CONSIDERATION

That systematic analysis of English poems
indicates the existence of a distinct structural
differentiation of vocabularies into three main
types:

I.   A type of vocabulary purely, or mainly,
mono-dissyllabic, *i. e.*, showing a characteristic
occurrence of polysyllables running from 0 to
about 2%.

II.   A type of medium structural complexity,
i. e., showing a characteristic occurrence of poly-
syllables running from about 3% to about 5½%,
with a tendency to drop towards 2% and to rise
towards 6%.

III.   A type of extreme structural com-
plexity, *i. e.*, showing a characteristic occurrence

7

of polysyllables running from about 7% to about 8½%, with a tendency to drop towards 6% and to rise towards 9½% (or 10%?).

Note: The term "polysyllable" is used to include all words over two syllables in length.

The discussion of the sub-thesis falls into three main parts:

A.   Presentation of analysis
   1. Derivation of scale of polysyllabic occurrence for experimental testing from
      (a) 125 Nursery Rhymes
      (b) Milton (Table I)
      (c) Pope (Table II)

   2. First testing of scale from the work of
      (a) Tennyson (Table III)
      (b) Swinburne (Table IV)
      (c) Francis Thompson (Table V)
      (d) Maurice Hewlett (Table VI)

B.   Summary of three important points involved in differentiation of vocabularies
     1. Elementary word-forms entering into combination
     2. Range of values in word-accent
     3. Conditions of "weighting"

*C. Importance of differentiation of vocabu-
laries in study of Metrics indicated with
reference to*

    1. The problem as a whole

    2. Tennyson and the development of
the decasyllable

    3. Swinburne and the development of
triple rhythms

A STUDY IN ENGLISH METRICS

A STUDY IN ENGLISH METRICS

It is my object in the present discussion to
venture the suggestion that an important appli-
cation of phonetics to metrical problems lies in
the · study of phonetic word-structure. I have ·
given first (in tentative formulation, of course)
a specific conclusion with supporting data, and
second a brief indication of the reasons for main-
taining the general position. To deal with a
definite, if still limited, range of fact before ap-
proaching the wider theoretical issues has seemed
to me the better method, at least for the present.
One offers thus as first evidence the results of
systematic analysis and in so far as these possess,
or seem to possess, a certain solidity and co-
herence within themselves, they are in some sort
a guarantee that the underlying theory is worthy
of attention.

May I say that the statement here given is to
be regarded as nothing more formal or definitive
than a first rough summary drawn up in order to

open discussion and (if the conclusions indicated
will hold at all) to serve as a basis for correction
and further investigation?

I

The position taken can be outlined quickly
and, for the time being, with I think fair ex-
plicitness in the following way. Scansion iso-
lates, for the sake of analysis, the basic metrical
units of verse—feet; the same analytical scrutiny
must, I believe, be given to the basic phonetic
units of speech—*i. e.,* phonetic word-forms—be-
fore we can possess sufficient data for the study
of one of the fundamental problems of verse as a
whole, the relation of the word to the foot.
The scope of the proposed analysis must evi-
dently parallel within its own field that of
scansion within the metrical field; that is, as the
study of English scansion deals with the whole
possible variety of metrical units in English
verse and with the special occurrence of these in
individual poems, so the study of phonetic word-
structure must deal with the whole variety of
word-forms existing in English and with the

comparative occurrence of these in specific vocabularies.

Obviously there can be given, at this time, in support of the position outlined but a limited amount of experimental analysis, and as obviously, one must select for this first examination and presentation a group of facts which will yield results of main or central significance. Accordingly I submit for immediate consideration, as summarizing what seems to be the most important single issue involved, the following tentative formulation, namely—

That the systematic analysis of English poems seems to indicate the existence of a tendency toward distinct structural differentiations of vocabulary, the main types being three in number:—

I. A type of vocabulary purely, or mainly, mono-dissyllabic.

II. A type showing medium structural complexity, *i. e.,* containing a medium number of words of three syllables and over.

III. A type showing extreme structural complexity, *i. e.,* containing an extreme number of words of three syllables and over.

Before proceeding to the discussion of this

thesis, it is necessary to deal with certain questions of detail—more especially with certain difficulties—which are bound to arise in the actual carrying out of the work.

In the first place, even admitting it to be theoretically desirable, do we possess to-day a pronunciation sufficiently standardized to make possible the analysis of vocabularies on anything like the scale suggested? Variations in pronunciation are notorious. How can we be assured that a classification of the words in any given poem will represent the pronunciation of the poet who wrote? Is it not, rather, certain that the analysis will depend upon the pronunciation of the critic who dissects, and that the results of analysis will, consequently, vary with each new critic? And further, will not the difficulties be hopelessly increased when different historic periods are to be considered? No attempt is made to minimize these difficulties, nor, for the present, to meet them in detail. Two immediately practical considerations are, however, urged.

First, as to uncertainties of pronunciation *per se*. Nothing it should be noted is under present

examination except syllabification (*i. e.,* the number of syllables); possible differences of accentuation do not enter into the matter at all. Moreover, since the classification of vocabularies in question is based on the relative occurrence of words of three syllables and over, only two main groupings of words are dealt with: the mono-dissyllabic group regarded as a whole; the "polysyllabic" group regarded as a whole. As a practical matter of fact, therefore, as far as the present investigation is concerned, the cases of possible uncertainty narrow down to the particular group of words where there is a question between two and three syllables. I do not think that, however classified, the number of words in this group is large enough to affect, in any serious way, the general results obtained.

Second, as to the question of changing standards of pronunciation. Here again nothing is urged beyond the reduction to a minimum of the difficulties involved—in this case by selecting as far as possible work which allows the use of what may be roughly called the present standard of pronunciation. The single exception to this is the work of Milton. Here what may be roughly

called the "Elizabethan" standard has been used.
This statement, it is most hastily to be said, im-
plies no absurd assertion that one has been able
to reconstruct Elizabethan pronunciation as a
whole. For the practical matter in hand, the
main concern is simply with the fuller syllabifica-
tion of a perfectly well-recognized class of words
—the ion, ious, etc. class. In the analysis of
Milton's vocabulary given below this fuller syl-
labification has been kept as consistently as pos-
sible—ocean, union, nation, for instance, being
counted as trisyllables. It is to be noted, how-
ever, that the point made just previously holds
here also. The results, as stated, would be af-
fected only by the classification of those words
where there is the question of a change from
three to two syllables.

One somewhat smaller detail is still to be men-
tioned—the classification of compounds. The
rule followed has been to regard compounds as
whole words, many-fountained, for instance, be-
ing classed as a word of four syllables. In finer
analysis it will, of course, become necessary to
take into account the extent to which compounds
are present in the whole polysyllabic group—as

it is also necessary to take into account the extent
to which proper names are present.

Turning now to my thesis, I have chosen the
following poems for first analysis: (a) 125
Nursery Rhymes, (b) Paradise Lost and Sam-
son Agonistes, (c) five of Pope's poems (see
below). The reason for this selection is plain
enough. If they exist at all, we have here, pretty
clearly, examples of the three indicated types of
vocabulary. It is difficult, at any rate, to imag-
ine much doubt as to the facts that in Nursery
Rhymes there are few "long" words, while Mil-
ton's is the great example in English verse of a
polysyllabic vocabulary, or probably, as to the
fact that Pope's vocabulary would come some-
where between these two extremes. The first
business in hand is, therefore, to see whether sys-
tematic analysis will bear out this impression of
differentiation where it is strongest, and, if so,
what exacter arithmetical values are to be given
to the words in which the range of difference has
so far been expressed. What, in English, do we
more precisely mean by "few" or "more," or
"many" polysyllables?

My results for the 125 Nursery Rhymes are as
follows: first, 59 of the Rhymes—very nearly
half (47.2%)—are purely mono-dissyllabic; sec-
ond, taking the Rhymes as a whole, of the total
number of words used (6,928), 97.86% belong to
the mono-dissyllabic group, 2.13% to the poly-
syllabic group.

At the lowest extreme may, therefore, be
placed an occurrence of polysyllables running
from zero to about 2%.

The next section of analysis—that of Milton
and Pope—can best be given in tabulated form.
(See p. 21.)

Summarizing: the tables show a characteristic
occurrence of polysyllables in Milton's poems
running from about 7% to about $8\frac{1}{2}$%, with a
tendency to drop toward 6% and to rise to 9%,
and a characteristic occurrence in the poems by
Pope running from about 4% to about $5\frac{1}{2}$%.

These figures may be held, tentatively, to rep-
resent the extreme and the medium occurrence of
polysyllables.

TABLE I.

MILTON		Total No. of words	Per cent Mono-dissyllabic	Per cent Polysyllabic
Paradise Lost	I......	5,960	91.67	8.33
	II......	7,917	92.24	7.75
	III......	5,566	92.07	7.92
	IV......	7,700	92.74	7.24
	V......	6,804	92.01	7.99
	VI......	6,773	90.95	9.03
	VII......	4,774	91.40	8.58
	VIII......	4,921	91.45	8.53
	IX......	9,010	93.01	6.98
	X......	8,370	91.74	8.24
	XI......	6,859	92.48	7.50
	XII......	4,930	91.78	8.21
Total.............		79,584	92.03	7.95
Samson Agonistes				
Dialogue.............		9,465	92.04	7.94
Choruses.............		3,427	90.92	9.08
Total.............		12,892	91.75	8.23

TABLE II.

POPE		Total No. of words	Per cent Mono-dissyllabic	Per cent Polysyllabic
Essay on Criticism......		5,744	94.91	5.08
The Rape of the Lock...		6,149	94.71	5.28
Elegy—Unfortunate Lady		652	95.86	4.14
Essay on Man	I......	2,288	94.32	5.68
	II......	2,251	94.32	5.68
	III......	2,481	94.43	5.56
	IV......	3,141	95.54	4.46
Total.............		10,161	94.72	5.27
Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot		3,353	95.91	4.09

Restating now the description of the types as at first given we have:

I.   A type of vocabulary purely, or mainly, mono-dissyllabic: *i. e.,* containing a characteristic occurrence of words of three syllables and over, running from 0 to about 2%.

II.   A type of medium structural complexity: *i. e.,* containing a characteristic occurrence of words of three syllables and over, running from about 4% to about 5½%, with, probably, a tendency to drop towards 3% and to rise toward 6%.

III.   A type of extreme structural complexity: *i. e.,* showing a characteristic occurrence of words of three syllables and over, running from about 7% to about 8½%, with a tendency to drop towards 6% and to rise to 9%.

The next step is to see how far the scheme thus roughly established can be applied with reference to the vocabularies of other poems. Here selection has been made—always the selection of *whole* poems—from the work of Tennyson, Swinburne, Francis Thompson and Mr. Maurice Hewlett. The results of analysis are given in tabulated form.

TABLE III.

TENNYSON	Total No. of words	Per cent Mono- dissyllabic	Per cent Polysyllabic
Oenone................	1,988	94.31	5.68
Ulysses...............	556	96.94	3.05
Tithonus..............	599	96.33	3.67
The Coming of Arthur...	4,256	96.54	3.45
Merlin and Vivien......	7,896	95.88	4.10
Lancelot and Elaine.....	11,799	95.83	4.15
The Holy Grail.........	7,474	96.48	3.50
Guinevere.............	5,671	95.68	4.30
The Passing of Arthur...	3,855	96.59	3.39

TABLE IV.

SWINBURNE	Total No. of words	Per cent Mono- dissyllabic	Per cent Polysyllabic
Chastelard I..........	4,712	98.59	1.40
II..........	3,975	98.56	1.43
III..........	3,703	98.65	1.35
IV..........	7,061	98.30	1.68
V..........	6,001	98.18	1.81
Total..............	25,452	98.42	1.57
Atalanta in Calydon			
Dialogue.............	12,832	95.84	4.14
Choruses.............	5,536	96.83	3.17
Total..............	18,368	96.14	3.85
Hymn to Proserpine.....	1,003	97.50	2.49
Hesperia..............	1,283	97.03	2.96
The Forsaken Garden ...	671	98.80	1.19

TABLE V.

FRANCIS THOMPSON	Total No. of words	Per cent Mono-dissyllabic	Per cent Polysyllabic
The Hound of Heaven....	1,205	92.61	7.38
An Anthem of Earth....	2,798	90.59	9.39
Sister Songs I.........	2,658	92.02	7.97
II........	5,457	92.11	7.89
Total..............	8,115	92.06	7.92

TABLE VI.

MAURICE HEWLETT	Total No. of words	Per cent Mono-dissyllabic	Per cent Polysyllabic
Minos, King of Crete....	7,882	96.41	3.59
Ariadne in Naxos.......	8,325	95.92	4.07
Death of Hippolytus....	8,080	95.96	4.03

It is clear that these vocabularies fall readily into the suggested classification.

In the work of Tennyson the vocabulary used is of the "medium" type, but it is to be remarked that while in the poems of Pope under analysis the tendency is to rise from 4% toward 5%, there is here a tendency to drop from 4% toward 3%.

Also of the medium type, "Atalanta in Calydon" shows the same tendency, while the "Hymn to Proserpine" and "Hesperia" drop still further, from 3% towards 2%. In "Chastelard"

and "The Forsaken Garden" the occurrence, under 2%, is that of the first type. The use of so markedly mono-dissyllabic a vocabulary is, of course, particularly to be noted in a poem of the length of "Chastelard."

The work of Francis Thompson, without any analysis easily to be recognized as of the "extreme" polysyllabic type, shows, under analysis, in the three poems chosen, the characteristic occurrences derived from Milton—7% to 9%.

Mr. Maurice Hewlett, on the other hand, uses in his trilogy, "The Agonists," the medium type of vocabulary, with, as in the case of Tennyson, the 3-4% occurrence rather than the 4-5% exemplified by Pope.

Thus the only changes to be made as the result of this section of analysis are to give 2% as the lower limit of polysyllabic occurrence for the medium type of vocabulary and to indicate a slight tendency to rise above 9% in the extreme type, taking 9½% (or, perhaps, even 10%?) as the experimental upper limit.

I can carry the direct demonstration of my thesis no farther at present. It remains in this

direction but to continue analysis, working at the two main groupings of words here given and, at the resolution of these into their finer sub-divisions, establishing the percentages of separate occurrence for the main classes of words (monosyllables, dissyllables, trisyllables, etc.) and within each of these main classes as a whole, the percentage occurrence of their respective accentual sub-types. This detailed analysis will give (as that already submitted for the larger groupings) exacter information as to total range of occurrence and as to comparative occurrence in specific vocabularies.

But continuance of analysis without pausing to consider the many delicate and controversial questions involved would be unprofitable and it would be, I think, unsatisfactory, even apart from these difficulties, to present further accumulations of fact without meeting directly the cardinal issue of their prosodic application. To this issue I therefore turn in the second part of my exposition.

May I however at this juncture make some brief and informal comment on points connected not with the prosodic application but with the

purely linguistic interest of the matters just pre-
sented? So far as I know the analysis covers
new ground and I naturally find myself wonder-
ing to what extent the facts revealed may seem
in and of themselves important—whether, that is,
the suggestion that such differentiations of vo-
cabulary may exist will arrest attention as rais-
ing a question of genuine significance in regard
to English and whether it seems more useful to
express the total and comparative occurrences of
the various word-forms in definite arithmetical
values rather than in the vague terms of few,
more and many. It may be that such data as this
would be valuable in tracing the historic develop-
ment of English and in establishing comparisons
between English and the "more" polysyllabic
languages?

That the few polysyllables of English are lit-
erally so few surprised me. I had expected (or
since I was surprised I suppose I had expected)
a generally higher percentage of occurrence.
The marked stability of the various occurrences
surprised me, too; I had expected rather wider
fluctuations.

II

The task of formulating a single proposition and presenting facts in evidence now gives way to the more intricate business of showing this proposition not in isolation but as part of a consistent theory of English verse-structure as a whole. That I give the merest first sketch of such inclusive formulation has already been stated and is surely too obvious to need repetition, but I should like to add that, acutely aware at once of the difficulties involved and of my own but slender competence, I mean to go no further in the unavoidable generalizations than is necessary in order to indicate the connections which I think it may be possible to establish. My discussion moreover will be cast as little as possible in terms of pure theory and as much as possible in terms of technique. And, finally, it may be well to say at once that small emphasis is put upon any matter of novelty, that in fact, as will in a moment appear, it is for the most part the quite contrary point which is insisted upon.

It will make probably for greater clearness and economy if I work again from the central point of a single sharply formulated thesis. I submit therefore the following, namely:—

That no prosodic theory is adequate which fails explicitly to recognize within verse-structure as a whole a complex of three inter-existent structures: *1.* the verse-form proper, itself twofold, consisting of (a) the rhythmic arrangement and (b) the syllabic arrangement by means of which the rhythm is exteriorized; and *2.* the sub-structural phonetic speech-arrangement.

By the phonetic sub-structure I mean, finally, everything connected with the organized physical material of language; but attention in the present discussion is sharply focused on the word, which, I would contend, is in its phonetic aspect the basic structural unit of language physically considered as the foot is the basic structural unit of the verse-form proper.

The discussion will fall into two parts: first, as preliminary, a rapid consideration of the extent to which English prosodic theory has so far tended to recognize, either as a whole or in part, the principles here stated; and, second, a state-

ment of the more important points in technique
which, if correctly observed, seem to force the
acceptance of the thesis, again in the end, as a
whole, but with a present emphasis on the valid-
ity of the last term.

(1)

In considering the first point, I must more
than ever deal in makeshift discussion since its
adequate treatment would require, what I by no
means possess, a thorough-going knowledge of
the historical development of English prosodic
theory. Rather however than leave (the only
alternative) an absolute gap in my argument, I
give for what it is worth the following roughly
generalized statement of what seems to emerge
as a coherent line of development. It will serve
at any rate to recognize the fact that the ability
to demonstrate the steady convergence of theo-
retical speculation toward it as a common con-
clusion will be an important factor in the estab-
lishment of any final synthesis.

At the beginning of the sequence, then, as I
see it, are to be considered the prosodists who
think of verse as a simple uncomplex whole.

Among these are most of the earlier and a scattering of the later men. Professor Saintsbury is (I think) the main present exponent of a theory based upon any such unanalyzed reaction. It is also significant to note that we have here the average layman's view of the matter. In this stage of introspective observation conscious attention seems to be focused on the arrangement of syllables by means of which the rhythm is exteriorized (the *b* term of my thesis).

Such simplification has, in the main, given way to conscious awareness of the differentiated rhythmic arrangement and I think it would probably be safe to say that many present-day metrists tend to recognize the twofold character of the verse-form proper (the co-existent *a-b* terms of my thesis). The development of this awareness of the rhythmic factor *per se*, signalized (I suppose?) by the appearance of the "musical" and "temporal" scansionists, may be said to mark the second stage in introspective analysis, what had seemed to be an uncomplex whole now revealing itself as a complex entity containing within itself two inter-existent entities.

It is not to be expected, however, that the new

theoretical formulation conditioned by the advance in accuracy of observation should be immediately achieved. There is especially to be reckoned with, as one would expect, a tendency to throw very great emphasis on the newly observed factor, rhythm, and where this is carried to the extent of a decided over-emphasis an important result follows—the failure, namely, properly to correlate the manifestation of rhythm under consideration with its specialized medium, in this case, language. Such failure is probably to be regarded as the vitiating flaw in the theories of the musical scansionists and, it follows, of their method which is based on an attempt to transfer the terms and notation developed in relation to the manifestations of rhythm in one material to its manifestations in a different material. It is also to be noted that where over-emphasis on the rhythmic factor exists in any marked degree it results, naturally, in reversion toward the primitive view of verse as an uncomplex whole, but with conscious attention now shifted to focus on the rhythmic arrangement (the *a* term of my thesis). The treatment which (so far as my knowledge goes)

shows least any such deflection of emphasis is that of Mr. T. S. Omond. Mr. Omond, if I understand him, while differentiating sharply between the rhythmic arrangement and the manifesting syllabic structure, indicates with equal clearness their proper condition of inter-existence within the verse-form as a unit.

Nor, further, is it to be expected that the more complex methods necessitated by the advance in theory should be immediately perfected. As a matter of fact the crucial change in method inherent in the new theoretical standpoint would not be immediately apparent and one of the most important achievements of recent prosodic study has been, I should say, to discover and state this change. The desideratum is, clearly, a method allowing the close study of the rhythmic groups of verse, the "musical" scansion just mentioned being an attempt to meet this need. What has now become apparent is that we soon reach here the limits of possible analysis based on simple observation "by ear" or by our "sense of" rhythm. The delicate and accurate study of the rhythmic groups of verse must, it is seen, be carried on by means of laboratory experiment. This issue as

to method, the importance of which it seems to
me impossible to exaggerate, has now been
definitely raised, more especially, whatever one
may think of his conclusions, by M. Paul Ver-
rier. As a result it is no longer possible to dis-
cuss except on the basis of relevant evidence
gathered by genuinely scientific laboratory
analysis such fundamental questions of verse-
structure as the isochronism of the rhythmic
groups or—the crux of the whole matter—the
fundamental difference between prose and verse.
It is to be noted that in thus correlating the prob-
lem of rhythm in verse with the whole rhythmic
problem there is necessitated, since a speech-
group is concerned, making relevant questions of
syllabic length and the nature and function of
accent, a first application of experimental
phonetics to prosodic study.

Two stages in what may be at least reasonably
suggested as a coherent sequence in the develop-
ment of English prosodic theory have now been
indicated. Awareness of verse-structure in
terms of a naïve simplification gives way to
growing awareness of its real complexity. The
increased accuracy of observation conditions a

change in theoretical formulation and as obser-
vation and theory grow more precise they neces-
sitate commensurate advance in precision of
method. It is now the logically sequent step in
my argument to maintain that continued intro-
spective analysis of our reaction to verse-struc-
ture as a whole will next result in conscious
awareness of the existence within it of the sub-
structural speech-arrangement (the *2.* of my
thesis).

I give in briefest summary three points which
may not unreasonably be regarded as indicating
this to be in fact the case.

(a) There is discernible in some recent dis-
cussions of English verse a growing reluctance
to admit any differentiated verse values as neces-
sary in accounting for verse-structure. This atti-
tude shows itself markedly in, for instance, the
discussion of "accent" or "stress" where an im-
portant controversial question is that relating to
the use in verse of syllables carrying secondary
word-accent and of certain grammatical classes
of words, conjunctions, prepositions, etc. The
"Rules of Stress Rhythm" formulated by Mr.
Robert Bridges give clear expression to the

opinion denying these any value in verse other than their "natural speech" value:—*e. g.,* Rule II "The stresses must all be true speech-stresses," and Rule IV "A stress has a peculiarly strong attraction for its own proclitics and en-clitics." (*Milton's Prosody,* p. 91, p. 93.) The same view is implicit in Mr. Maurice Hewlett's introductory note explaining the versification of *The Agonists.* "Now all I ask of mine [my hearers] is that the verse be read to them as prose, with the stresses where they would naturally fall, and full value given to the vowel sounds of ordinary speech. If this rule be observed, and the indicated pauses followed, the three plays ought to be revealed as verse" (*The Agonists,* pp. X-XI).

The attitude expressed in these statements is, I would submit, normally to be expected at the present stage in the development of English prosodic theory. It signalizes growing awareness of the speech-arrangement *per se,* manifesting at the same time exactly the over-emphasis on this arrangement which would naturally accompany its first conscious perception. The effect of such over-emphasis is seen in the in-

clination either to reduce the whole verse-struc-
ture to the speech-arrangement alone, thus re-
verting towards the primitive view of verse as an
uncomplex whole, or to suppress the middle term
(any differentiated syllabic arrangement, that
is) the speech-arrangement being regarded as
itself externalizing the rhythm.

(b) Other recent discussions, on the contrary,
recognize with varying degrees of explicitness
what is often called the "contrast" of speech- and
verse-units, or their "non-coincidence." In any
statement of this kind recognition of the dif-
ferentiated speech-arrangement is so clearly
made that it is difficult to give it distincter ex-
pression. When, for instance, Sir Walter Ra-
leigh writes of Milton—"His chief study, it will
be found, is to vary the word in relation to the
foot, and the sentence in relation to the line"
(*Milton,* p. 199)—he recognizes the co-existence
within the whole of the verse-form proper and
the substructural speech-arrangement and, not
only this, but he recognizes specifically, in the
first clause, what I have indicated as seeming to
me the primary structural point, the relation of
the foot to the word. In this connection I would

further, and especially, point out the importance
of Professor Saintsbury's insistence on the "non-
coincidence" of verse- and speech-units, particu-
larly (again in specific recognition) of the foot
and word. I have not made a detailed examina-
tion of Professor Saintsbury's prosodic state-
ment, but I am inclined at least to wonder
whether when in its final evaluation this is done,
his constantly increasing emphasis on just this
point of the non-coincidence of foot- and word-
division will not emerge as a feature of outstand-
ing significance. The first direct statement of it
(that I noticed at least) is in a foot-note—"I
think it is a mistake to try to make foot- corre-
spond with word-division: the best metre is often
that which divides the words most" (*History of
English Prosody,* I, p. 387). In the second and
third volumes the point is increasingly insisted
on, whether directly or by implication, reaching
in the third volume the clear-cut assertion that
". . . in poetry except in so far as our abun-
dant monosyllables prevent it we positively
avoid, save for special reasons, coincidence of
foot- and word-end" (*ibid.,* Vol. III, p. 456).
And now in the recently issued *History of Prose*

Rhythm Professor Saintsbury is almost ready to see in this fact of non-coincidence one of the fundamental differences between prose and verse, summarizing the view thus in his table of axioms and inferences: "There is no objection to the falling of a foot-end in the middle of a word. But it is less frequent in prose than in verse; and its comparative rarity perhaps furnishes one of the differences between prose- and verse-rhythm" (*History of English Prose Rhythm,* p. 479, ¶ 9).

In such recognitions of "contrast" or "non-coincidence" as these quoted from Professor Raleigh and Professor Saintsbury there is, again I would submit, a variant attitude which would normally occur, along with the one previously noted, at the present stage of development in English prosodic theory. We have here a clear awareness of the co-existent speech- and verse-arrangements within verse as a whole, an awareness acute moreover at the primary point, the relation of the two basic units concerned, the foot and the word; but the full theoretical implication of the observed fact is not discerned and there is consequently no generalized theoretical state-

ment of it. In this stage there is evidenced that curious condition of seeing and not seeing which, however difficult to describe or account for, is nevertheless as a psychological condition easily recognizable.

(c) And, third, it is possible to give at least one instance (there may be more) of the formulation which would naturally follow the one just described: a formulation, that is, in which the fact of the inter-existence within verse as a whole of the verse- and speech-arrangements is not only observed but given its generalized theoretical value. I quote from Mr. Thomas Rudmose-Brown: "When M. Verrier retorts . . . . that 'Phonetics divides . . . in accordance with what we hear' and that metrics cannot divide otherwise on pain of being but 'arbitrary dogmatism' he ignores *what is fundamental in all metrical investigation,* namely that a line of verse is a portion of speech-material with all its phonetic features (corresponding to its ethos as well as its logos) *adjusted,* without violence, to a fixed and definite metrical scheme. The two entities, metrical scheme and portion of speech-material adjusted thereto, are distinct and the

chief study of the metricist is the manner of adjustment of the latter to the former, the way in which a suitable portion of phonetic liquid is chosen and poured into metrical bottles" (*English and French Metric, Modern Language Review*, Jan., 1913, p. 104). I do not know to what extent Mr. Rudmose-Brown develops the statement here made in his general treatment of metrics (the matter is complicated by his postulation of two different basic principles as operative in English verse) but this is, as far as it goes, clear enough to serve fairly, I think, as evidence in the matter at issue.

For these reasons, then, it seems to me that it may be possible to correlate present analyses of verse-structure with the sequence in development experimentally postulated for English prosodic theory as a whole. We find, to recapitulate, in considering these analyses in relation to the assumed next step in that development, *i. e.,* growing awareness of the sub-structural speech-arrangement as existent within verse-structure as a whole:—(a) statements conditioned by so keen an awareness of this arrangement, in its first conscious perception, that it obliterates or

obscures conscious awareness of the other in-
cluded arrangements: (b) statements condi-
tioned by an awareness which extends to recog-
nition of the fact of the inter-existence of the
verse- and speech-arrangements but which stop
short of any clearly generalized perception of the
theoretical implications of the fact: (c) a state-
ment which, conditioned by such generalized per-
ception, gives generalized theoretical formula-
tion.   These statements, taken together, show,
I would now submit, the third main stage in the
postulated sequence to be in process of accom-
plishment, and it is clear that a main justification
of the present discussion would rest upon the
assumption that it represents the next step in
this process, *i. e.,* the step necessitated by the fact
that generalized theoretical formulation is not
really complete until it is accompanied by a fully
conscious awareness of the necessary implica-
tions as to method.   It is this issue as to method
which is here definitely raised, and I would in-
sist that if the position taken will hold at all, it
holds as part of it that we have now reached in
relation to the third main advance in correct ob-
servation, as already in relation to the second, a

place where the issue as to method becomes a
crucial one. The desideratum in this case is a
method allowing that close study of the sub-
structural speech-arrangement which is neces-
sary to a proper understanding of the co-existent
verse-arrangement. Such methodical investiga-
tion must, I would contend, begin at the basic
point, the relation of the foot to the word and
this brings me, in theoretical approach, to my
initial, and central, suggestion—*that an impor-
tant application of phonetics to metrical prob-
lems lies in the study of phonetic word-structure*
(see p. 1) since it is only by means of such study
that we can obtain the requisite information as to
the principles of phonetic word-structure, the
varieties (in their inherent classification) of
English phonetic word-forms and their compara-
tive occurrences. I have in the analysis already
submitted, put this suggestion into experimental
operation using the method advocated, not to
present a new point, but to test certain basic dif-
ferences in vocabularies of which we seem to get
clear and unmistakable first report "by ear."
The results obtained tend, it has been seen, to
verify this impression, but while the first un-

tested report gives us information in vague terms
and is even within these limits generally satis-
factory only where extremes are concerned—
where we have to distinguish, that is, between
an unmistakably mono-dissyllabic and an un-
mistakably polysyllabic vocabulary—systematic
analysis not only translates vague into determin-
ate arithmetic values but allows the tracing of
intermediate gradations with a precision and
delicacy otherwise impossible.

Is it necessary to say that one is of course all
the time working "by ear"—but by a reasoned
and tested hearing?

<div align="center">(2)</div>

It remains to indicate how the study of word-
structure can be considered to have direct bear-
ing on specific problems of verse-technique.
There has been, of course, throughout the whole
discussion implicit general assumption that such
direct bearing exists, for if we recognize "by
ear" the varying of the word in relation to the
foot, or structural differences in vocabularies, it
is because these as basic conditions are perceived
by us in terms of total final effect. The present

infinitely difficult and elusive problem is to re-
solve the whole generalized observation into its
component detail. Again it is necessary to write
selectively, choosing only what has main signifi-
cance and presenting not full discussion but con-
densed outline.

Perhaps it may be as well to give first, with
momentary disconnection from the central thesis,
such part of the matter as can be considered with
little or no reference to any particular theory.

To begin with, then, it is to be noted that
where a mono-dissyllabic vocabulary is used the
completed arrangement is constructed, entirely
or almost entirely, of combinations of two main
phonetic word-forms, one of these the dissyllabic,
existing in two sub-forms. With the introduc-
tion of polysyllables the number of different ele-
mentary word-forms increases, the completed ar-
rangement being composed of combinations not
of two, but of three, four, five or more main
word-forms with the corresponding increase in
the number of sub-forms. There is then to be
considered in a polysyllabic as opposed to a
mono-dissyllabic vocabulary an increase in the
variety of elementary word-forms entering into

combination to form the completed arrangement.

A main distinction between the "shorter" and "longer" word-forms—the distinction which justifies their division into two main groups— lies in the fact that the longer word necessitates for its construction the use of a second accentual value, secondary word-accent. With the increased variety in word-forms found in the polysyllabic vocabulary there is, then, also to be considered the introduction of this further value in word-accent.

A third point in connection with the introduction of polysyllables seems to me of great and perhaps not always fully realized importance; its effect, I mean, on the problem of what for lack of a better term may be called the problem of weighting. The English monosyllable is in general a "full" or "heavy" syllable; polysyllables contain usually one or more "light" syllables. When therefore a vocabulary contains a very high percentage of monosyllables it tends, roughly speaking, to be in a consistent condition of heavy weighting; with an increase, in dissyllables as well, but more especially of polysyllables, the number of light syllables increases and

when these reach a sufficiently high occurrence
the significant fact to notice is that the vocabu-
lary containing, as always in English, a large
number of heavy syllables, combines with these
an appreciable number of syllables in the oppo-
site condition of lightness.

This I state with reference to the present pro-
nunciation of English. The problem of weight-
ing, I may note, seems to have been most ex-
plicitly discussed in connection with the changed
condition in the language resulting from the loss
of the final *e*. That this meant not only a struc-
tural change as altering in many words the num-
ber of their syllables, but that it also, owing to
the complete disappearance of so large a number
of light syllables, brought about a general
change in weighting throughout the language is
commonly recognized, together with the special
effect of this latter change on Milton's technical
problem as compared with Chaucer's. I have
been, to add a related comment, puzzled over the
fact that while the final *e* and its vanishment
have been, as all the world knows, so thoroughly
dealt with, an analogous change from Eliza-
bethan (or Tudor) pronunciation to our own has

been left, naturally not unnoticed, but rather strikingly undiscussed, at any rate in its prosodic connection. This change, affecting words in ion, ious, etc. (see p. 18), resulted, as did the loss of the *e,* in the shortening of many words by one syllable and in the consequent total loss of a large number of light syllables; moreover, since these syllables occurred always within the word, the resultant change in its flexibility is even greater; and finally, what did not at all follow the loss of the *e,* there results in this case a marked increase in the occurrence of certain consonantal sounds, notably *sh.* It needs but to mention as example the Cherub Contemplation. Keightley, noting his usage in regard to Hebrew and Classical proper names, says that Milton "abhorred *sh*" (Geightley, *Life, Opinions and Writings of John Milton,* London, 1859, p. 439, p. 448).

However detail must wait for later discussion. The main conditions involved, here not much more than enumerated, are (1) the total number of word-forms entering into combination to form the completed arrangement (2) the range of values in word-accent (3) general conditions of

weighting. The question, irrespective of theory, is whether these conditions tend to force themselves on one's observation as significant conditions within the medium. The discussion already given goes to show that there is an increasing tendency to note just such conditions and, as a matter of fact, it would, I suppose, be agreed without any discussion that the particular observations enumerated present in themselves nothing new. The argument flows not from assumption of novelty but from the assumption that a general tendency to note certain conditions, with whatever degree of indirectness, is in itself evidence for the correctness and importance of the observations and at once furnishes and justifies the impulse to correlate all cognate observations as a means of dealing adequately with the question of their total significance. And with this final question of significance to be met, there must be a return to the sharply defined theoretical connection.

I make now curt experimental assumption first of the complexity of the whole verse-structure as stated in my second thesis: second of the classification of vocabularies as stated in my first

thesis: and, finally, I shall add to these, since it is
not here under direct discussion, such assump-
tions regarding the verse-form proper as are
necessary to my argument.

I must obviously, where the verse-form itself is
concerned, work with reference to a primary
classification according to rhythm. I assume,
therefore, the existence in English verse of two
main rhythms, duple and triple, each existing in
two varieties: duple rhythm, rising and falling,
and triple rhythm, rising and falling. In duple
rhythm the "normal" syllabic unit, or foot, con-
tains two syllables: in triple rhythm three syl-
lables; the difference in cadence, whether rising
or falling, is determined by the position of the
"strong" or "accented" syllable. This is to fol-
low more particularly Mr. Omond's suggested
classification (*A Study of Metre*) and it is Mr.
Omond's whole theory that I have at this point
most in mind; however the terms are, I think,
widely enough used to be generally intelligible
without special explanation and their relation to
the more frequently used classical terms suffi-
ciently obvious. The correspondence of the two
sets of terms barely needs stating; what is here

called verse in duple rhythm, rising cadence, is identifiable with the English verse called "iambic": duple rhythm, falling cadence, with "trochaic": triple rhythm, rising cadence, with "anapæstic": triple rhythm, falling cadence, with "dactylic." As to the correctness of the description implied in either set of terms there is much question; as to the verse to be identified (even with the rejection of both descriptions) very little.

Given these assumptions, my first point is that an exact study of verse-technique requires specialized reference to each of the main kinds of rhythm, in their two varieties, since with the changes in the structural unit appearing as norm, the conditions of the problem change. This, which would be true even were a simple structure concerned, is in a complex entity of essential importance since with a change in any one of the arrangements a whole new series of inter-relationships is established.

And, further, for the same reason, specialized reference to the main kinds of rhythm is not alone sufficient, but there must be such reference to each kind in rhythm as correlated with each

kind in vocabulary. The primary classification as to rhythm—the final æsthetic condition—must, that is, be correlated with the primary classification of structural phonetic conditions in language—the medium—before a complete statement of the technical problem is possible. We must in each particular case know whether we have the rhythm, duple or triple, operating in relation to a vocabulary of the mono-dissyllabic type, or of the type of medium or of extreme structural complexity. Thus what would be, if English vocabularies showed a uniform structural character, two main specialized conditions becomes, with the assumed differentiations, six main specialized conditions—(or twelve, allowing for the two varieties in each rhythm).

This evidently gives, in effect, a general scheme for the study of English verse technique, necessarily resulting from the assumptions made as to the principles of verse-structure as a whole, a scheme which at once summarizes within itself its determining principles and furnishes the basis for their further analytical testing.

First illustrative application of the method suggested may be rapidly outlined with refer-

ence to the problem which arises in connection with syllables carrying secondary word-accent, where the question at issue is whether these syllables can be used as "accented" (or "long" or "strong") syllables in verse. This has already been noted (p. 36) as a controversial question and that it has become so may fairly be regarded as indicating its importance. I am here concerned with noting the connections which must be established as a condition of its adequate treatment, not with the statement or discussion of the problem within itself.

In approaching, then, the systematic study of the problem of secondary word-accent there must be, in accordance with the scheme outlined, first reference to the structural character of the vocabulary. Where there is a purely mono-dissyllabic vocabulary the problem obviously does not exist; on the other hand in the extreme polysyllabic vocabulary, where secondary accent-syllables reach their highest occurrence, the problem is present in its most acute form. In one case, to leave it for the moment in terms of extremes, the poet would have worked, nat-

urally, with no reference to a non-existent condition; in the other, reference to an acutely existing condition would have been a constantly determining factor in the development of the technique as a whole.

Statement in exact terms of the occurrence of the problem requires, next, correlation of the rhythmic condition with the structural units of the vocabulary. Here I shall limit myself to the barest indication of the central issue given with reference to verse in duple rhythm, rising cadence ("iambic") and in triple rhythm, rising cadence ("anapæstic"). The fuller and finer statement of the initial problem and the question of its solution—the way, that is, in which English poets have actually dealt with it—must be left for later, separate discussion.

Concisely given the issue is this. When the verse is in duple rhythm (rising) the occurrence of every word over two syllables in length except mid-stress trisyllables will, if the "normal" dissyllabic foot is to be kept, force the occurrence of a syllable carrying secondary word-accent in the verse-accent place: *e. g.*

To whom thus Mičhael. Death thou hast seen   P. L.
XI. 466.
   Ithŭriel and Zephon with winged speed   P. L. IV.
788.

If on the other hand there is non-occurrence of
the secondary accent-syllable in this place condi-
tions arise which immediately bring up the ques-
tion of the admission of variant feet. The most
usual condition of non-occurrence is illustrated
in the following lines:

   Saw where the sword of Mic*hael* *smote,* and fell'd
P. L. VI. 250.
   Him thus intent Ithŭriel *with* his spear ,   P. L. IV.
810.

or to show both occurrence and non-occurrence in
the same line:

   A second Dan*iel*! a Dan*iel*, *Jew*!   *Merch.* of
Ven.

In triple rhythm verse (rising) the points to be
noted are that non-occurrence of the secondary
accent-syllable results in establishing a "normal"
trisyllabic foot:

   A sen*sitive* *plant* in a garden grew

   And the hy*acinth* *pur*ple, and white and blue
                              The Sensitive Plant.

or in establishing the condition illustrated in the following lines where there is evidently at least the possibility of a four-syllable foot to be considered:

The leaves they were with*ering and sere*

Our talk had been ser*ious and so*ber

<div align="right">Ulalume.</div>

while the occurrence of the secondary-accent syllable in the verse-accent place must result in establishing a variant dissyllabic unit:

The snow dr*op* and then the vi*olet*

The water-blooms under the riv*ulet*

<div align="right">The Sensitive Plant.</div>

Thus, in the main, there is an important reversal in the terms of the occurrence of the problem with the change of rhythm.

Systematic scrutiny of the problem, then, shows its absence or presence (and in what degree) as resulting from the structural character of the vocabulary. It shows that given the problem as a whole an important difference in its occurrence results from changes in the rhythmic condition and in so doing makes clear the close inter-connection at this point of the question of

secondary word-accent with the question of the admission of variant feet. Seen from this angle there is obviously established an important connection for the study of the central matter of interest as regards the verse-form proper—the syllabic variation occurring within the condition of rhythmic uniformity. And there is a further connection which may be just indicated—the connection with the problem of weighting. It is to be noted that there is here question of making syllables not only of secondary value in word-accent, but often in themselves extremely light syllables, carry verse-accent; and this, if it seem to present a difficulty in duple rhythm where a "normal" foot is concerned, will probably be felt to present an increased difficulty in triple rhythm where it will give a light syllable as the strong, or active, member of a foot already, in terms of the rhythmic norm, short of its full amount of sound material.

This, however stumblingly put, will serve to indicate in what way a scheme of correlated observations logically resultant from a consistent view of verse-structure as a whole will allow the posing of a whole problem, its limits defined, its

connections established. And it is a little difficult to see how, short of such schematic treatment, whether this or a righter one, it will ever be possible really to get anywhere.

A second and if less systematic perhaps more immediately vivid illustration of the method suggested may be indicated in terms of the poems already analyzed. And here, lest I seem guilty of evasion, I must dare, if ever so tentatively, foreshadowing answer to that question which is after all the final test of validity—but how far is all this necessary as a basis of right judgment? That I cannot, in the present stage of the work, go beyond the tentative and the foreshadowing (and in rather informal manner) is too clear to need emphasis.

What the 19th century thought of itself, what it thought of the 18th century, what we are to think of the 19th century, its work and its judgments—these are, I suppose, for whom such things exist at all, questions most alluring. And the allurement, unless one is the more deceived, is the ringing allurement of challenge. There is a present extraordinary aliveness in the air, a sharp exhilaration. We take poetry seriously

and feel ourselves confronted with immortal issues.

The names of Tennyson and Swinburne are two of the latest to be given great praise and latterly there has been some sound of dispraise. In the case of Tennyson a recent discussion gives for the matter this statement:

"The hosts of criticism, until lately subdued to a common domination, are now divided and there is no denying that the younger generation is distinctly hostile. And this attitude represents a corresponding hostility among a considerable (and that not the least intelligent) section of the public. It is idle to ignore this antipathy, idle to pretend that it has not some real justification. . . . What then is the gravamen of the charge against Tennyson? It is not surely any allegation of technical insufficiency. Indeed one suspects that recognition of the poet's commanding technical power adds not a little to the bitterness of the hostile feeling. It is rather as a 'thinker' (vile phrase!) that Tennyson is attacked" (*Tennyson and the Critics, The Spectator,* Feb. 22, 1913).

It is worth raising as a first question whether there is not in all of this an odd over-statement. Is there really on the part of the younger generation hostility, or is it indifference? Though indeed it makes an instant retort that precisely indifference is of all hostilities, if the stillest, therefore the most deadly. But whatever name it be given, the difference of attitude, the greater cool-

ness or the lesser warmth, is the significant fact; to account for it the problem. If I now take refuge in an increasing use of the pronoun of the first person it will be recognized, I hope, as being not the I of arrogance but the I of humility and caution. Just what may be in the composite mind of a total hungry generation I should scarce venture to say; I can but make sober and faithful report of what part of it is known to me as mine.

And for Tennyson my answer to any such statement as that which I have just quoted would be this. It is not a matter of bringing "charges" against him but of finding out what his work really is; and while there is not exactly "allegation of technical insufficiency" the question of technique is nevertheless at issue. Throughout the whole discussion cited as well as in the few sentences which I have quoted, the terms used in speaking of Tennyson's technique seem to me to show very great exaggeration, an exaggeration which results from the assumption of an illegitimate comparison. I quote another sentence in further illustration:

"Far and leisured was the journeying which enabled him to master the principles of rhythm and modulation established by his great precursors and elaborate them to a pitch of perfection and variety which no other poet has ever equalled."

And I add as expressing, but with greater definiteness, the·same way of thinking, a detached clause from a sentence in Professor White's introduction to his study of the verse of Greek comedy:— ". . . just as the English heroic line, passing from Shakespeare to Milton and from Milton on to Tennyson, became under his magic touch a new instrument of melody modulated to every theme" (White *The Verse of Greek Comedy,* p. VII). The assumption, implied in the discussion of *The Spectator,* directly expressed by Professor White, is that there is a literal technical advance from Milton to Tennyson. Now if my analysis is correct, and if the whole chain of reasoning so far presented is valid, it means that no such advance can exist, at least for the particular poems analyzed, since in them Milton and Tennyson work with reference to differentiated technical problems. Milton deals with the problems that I have indicated as inherent in a vocabulary of extreme structural

complexity; his greater variety of word-forms imposes upon him all the difficulties of their manipulation, problems of weighting, of the management of the delicate, and treacherous, secondary accent syllables, and with these, since it is verse in duple rhythm, the question of variant feet. These things if present for Tennyson are far less acutely present and with the change in the basic condition of the vocabulary, the whole weighting and balance of the line change.

Any literal technical comparison between Tennyson and Milton seems to me, then, to fall to the ground. The proper comparison, as I make it out, is between Tennyson and Pope. I am of course aware that there are between these two poets important secondary differences, especially, as to interlinear connection, the difference between blank and rhymed verse, and the different management of grammatical pause; but these do seem to me secondary differences and unquestionably important as they are, I cannot quite see how they can be allowed in any sound criticism to obscure the perception of a primary likeness.

Of Swinburne's craftsmanship there has been

much superlative speaking and again, with all deference, it seems to me an exaggerated speaking. Comparison has not been made between his and the Miltonic technique in the specific matter of the decasyllable (where I think no one asserts for Swinburne any absolute supremacy) and the question shifts to another ground. This I can best present by quoting two judgments lately expressed by Professor Gilbert Murray in his address—*What English Poetry May Still Learn from the Greek:*

"Professed imitations of Greek rhythm in English poetry seem to me to have gone practically always on quite wrong lines. They ought to have been more intensely rhythmical than the average; as a matter of fact they think they are being Greek when they lose lyrical rhythm altogether. Swinburne, as usual, as far as metre is concerned, gets triumphantly to the heart of the matter:

> She is cold and her habit is lowly,
> > Her temple of branches and sods;
> Most fruitful and virginal, holy,
> > A mother of Gods.

That has a strong clear rhythm, full of majesty and sweetness. . . . But if you take, let us say, the most admired lyrics in *Samson Agonistes:*

> God of our fathers, what is man?
> That thou towards him with a hand so various,
> Or might I say contrarious,
> Temper'st thy providence through his short course,
> Not evenly, as thou rul'st

> The angelic orders and inferior creatures, mute,
> Irrational, and brute;

or,

This, this is he: softly a while;
Let us not break in upon him. . . .
Or do my eyes misrepresent? Can this be he,
That heroic, that renowned
Irresistible Samson, whom unarmed
No strength of man or fiercest wild beast could withstand?
Who tore the lion as the lion tears the kid . . .

  This may be poetry of the highest order; I can quite im-
agine that those who know it by heart even enjoy the rhythm
of it. But surely it is clear that the rhythm is exceedingly
obscure and utterly unlyrical in quality?"

Professor Murray is in all these matters of the
elect, "a Roman of Rome and very well thought
of in Heaven"; yet may I, even with a little de-
corous impishness, suggest that his words con-
cerning Milton have familiar sound . . .
"one of the poems upon which much praise has
been bestowed . . . of which the diction is
harsh . . . the numbers unpleasing" . . .
and thus, remembering that the great Doctor
himself on occasions erred, gather courage for
disagreement?

Setting aside the question of Greek metres

NOTES—In the quotations from *Samson Agonistes* I have kept the punctuation
given by Mr. Murray in his printed paper (*Essays and Studies by Members of the Eng-
lish Association*, Vol. III, p. 27). It is not the punctuation given in Canon Beeching's
reprint of the edition of 1671.
  The absurdity "with a hand" must be (I suppose) a misprint.

(about which I, all woefully, know nothing) and holding to the question of English metres, in English poetry after all undeviatingly the main concern, the issue raised by any such statement seems to me to be this. The lines quoted by Professor Murray from Swinburne are in triple rhythm and it is Swinburne's handling of this rhythm that, at any rate "as far as metre is concerned," is oftenest given the unqualified enthusiasm of which I have spoken. It leaps to the mind in instant question—am I then to suppose that Swinburne's technique in triple rhythm is held to be, in general, comparable to the Miltonic technique in duple rhythm? It is for me an effort to phrase or squarely to envisage a notion so bewildering. Yet Professor Murray seems to make the comparison—and to the discomfiture of Milton. If imperturbability is for a moment wind-blown by gusty amazements it will be, I hope, forgiven me. After all there is difficulty in remaining imperturbable when one whose scholarship imposes an all wistful deference is heard saying that he "can imagine" it possible that one may "even enjoy" the rhythm of the *Samson* Choruses. For this long while the mere phrase

"he knows Greek" has seemed to me, one de-
prived and in exile, almost, for its potency, a
magic formula; yet here, and for not the first
time, I meet what I must believe to be a pro-
found and subtle initiation in the æsthetics of
Greek literature coupled with what I cannot
force my mind to see as other than an amazing
unawareness of the subtleties of the English
forms. It is not possible to live at peace in the
company of a bewilderment of this sort and at
least I have tried to find out what I mean. What
they mean, those more blessed others who "know
Greek," I can only, with every real and humblest
questioning, continue to ask.

And what, in the present instance, I mean,
since to justify my words I must here make re-
port, is this. The general point made for Tenny-
son and Milton in the matter of the decasyllable
will hold, within the limits of the analysis pre-
sented, in the case of Swinburne and Milton with
reference to the decasyllable, but also, and more
importantly, with reference to the different
rhythms. Swinburne, that is, in the poems
analyzed, works with vocabularies of the simpler
sort, either decidedly mono-dissyllabic or of the

medium type with the lower occurrence of poly-
syllables; and the different structural condition
in the vocabularies makes impossible, it seems to
me, for the reasons already given, any direct
technical comparison between his problem in
triple rhythm and Milton's in duple.

Further, this, as I make it out, has an impor-
tant bearing on our understanding of the his-
torical development of triple rhythms in English
poetry. Such a comparison as Professor Mur-
ray's seems at any rate to imply that we find in
Swinburne a poet using all the resources of the
language; in the analysis presented it is seen
that Swinburne works within a very limited
range. Unless he can be shown to have made
exclusions for special technical purposes, this, if
it holds for his work in general, means I think
that we find in him not a highly developed but an
early technique. He has not mastered all the
resources of the language; he has not even di-
vined their existence.

Between Milton and Swinburne there would
then be this tremendously significant difference,
that one stands at the end of a long sequence in
development, the other at the beginning of a

sequence. And it scarce needs the saying that there is here that which gives special direction to all the alertness of one's mind and sense. Suppose we are moving in the great main line of development in English poetry towards a mastery of triple rhythms really comparable to the *Samson* Choruses? Isn't that, then, the essential clue? And without it where are we?

The bearing of all this on the final question of exact discriminations is, I think, clear. If it be true, as I have suggested, that we approach, by intelligible stages, a completer understanding of the whole complexity of English verse-structure, it follows that our scrutiny will contain within itself a whole series of re-actions which, as felt not at all, or felt in some degree short of complete awareness, did not enter into the making of nineteenth century judgments. It presents itself as a not unreasonable contention that, given its existence, such an increase in fully conscious perception would be, necessarily, an essential factor in determining any critical re-estimation of values that may lie before us.

An opposite opinion is, I know, possible; but I confess that there is for me an inherent per-

suasiveness in the notion that finer comprehensions reflect themselves in finer and righter judgments.

It may be well to add brief safe-guard against possible misunderstanding at one point, where the types of vocabularies are concerned the sole intent has been to discover and state possible differences. There is no question whatever of translating these differences into absolute terms of better and worse. That English poetry may, in its vocabularies, possess a richness and complexity of three instead of a limited one is now the first consideration.

The next, which must be left for far fuller treatment, will concern the special conditions of achievement or failure within each type. Here but a single point may be glanced at as intimately connected with the work just discussed. How far is it likely, I wonder, that the question of the long poem will become in this connection an important one? Evidently dependence on a mono-dissyllabic vocabulary for the short lyric is one thing; its use in a poem of the length of *Chastelard* another.

And, finally, in dealing with observations of
this kind it must be remembered that the poet's
own awareness of his work, the extent to which
his activity is felt to be consciously directed, is
always a factor to be reckoned with. Again, rea-
soned exclusions are one thing; exclusions that
are accidental and quite unrealized by the poet
himself, are another.

NOTE

The work I wish to do next deals with the
problem of secondary-accent (pp. 53-57). The
analysis is already completed except for general
re-testing. It was in fact the analysis from
which the generalization as to the differentiated
vocabularies was originally derived. It includes
Gascoigne's "Steele Glas," "Tamburlaine," I
and II, "Lycidas," "Paradise Lost," "Samson
Agonistes," "An Essay on Criticism," "The
Rape of the Lock" and "Hyperion."

The most generally interesting points, I fancy,
would be the comparisons in technique between
"Paradise Lost" and "Samson Agonistes" and
between "Paradise Lost" and "Hyperion."

It seems to me that statement of the technical
difference at this point between the blank verse
of Milton and that of Keats throws a good deal
of light on Tennyson's work.

ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS

While it cannot now be systematically discussed, tabulated analysis is here given showing (a) for all the poems previously examined, the separate percentages for the occurrence of monosyllables and dissyllables (Tables VII-XII) and (b), for some few of the poems, the percentage of occurrence within the dissyllabic group as a whole of dissyllables accented on the last syllable. (Tables XIII-XV.)

These tables, that is, contain preliminary data for the closer study of the mono-dissyllabic group hitherto treated as a whole, giving the distribution of the two main types included within it, and, further, of the two sub-types included within the whole dissyllabic group. The closer study of the polysyllabic group must be carried out in the same way.

This detailed analysis will give (as the previous analysis for the larger groupings) exacter information as to the whole range of occurrence of types and sub-types considered separately,

and as to their relative occurrence in specific vo-
cabularies. For instance, as to range of occur-
rence, that there are "many" monosyllables in
English means, in verse, according to these re-
sults, a per cent occurrence running from the
71.43% of "Oenone" or the 73.39% of "Samson
Agonistes" to the 89.46% of "Chastelard"—
(and, of course, to the 100% found sometimes in
short poems). Roughly, that is, it is probable
that of the whole number of words in any Eng-
lish poem, at least 70% are monosyllables.
Again the fact that, in English, dissyllables ac-
cented on the first outnumber those accented on
the last syllable means, as here recorded, a range
of occurrence for the rarer sub-type (within the
group as a whole) running from the 35.30% of
"Samson Agonistes" down to the 11.11% of
"The Forsaken Garden"—(and to the 0% found
sometimes in shorter poems).

Tables giving separate percentages for the
occurrence of monosyllables and dissyllables fol-
low on pages 76-78.

TABLE VII. MILTON	Total per cent Mono-dissyllabic	Per cent Monosyllabic	Per cent Dissyllabic
Paradise Lost I......	91.67	72.06	19.61
II......	92.24	73.13	19.11
III......	92.07	73.30	18.77
IV......	92.74	75.23	17.51
V......	92.01	73.41	18.60
VI......	90.95	72.31	18.64
VII......	91.40	73.14	18.26
VIII......	91.45	74.65	16.80
IX......	93.01	74.52	18.49
X......	91.74	74.22	17.52
XI......	92.48	74.51	17.97
XII......	91.78	73.81	17.97
Total..............	92.03	73.75	18.28
Samson Agonistes			
Dialogue..............	92.04	73.98	18.06
Choruses..............	90.92	71.72	19.20
Total..............	91.75	73.39	18.36

TABLE VIII. POPE	Total per cent Mono-dissyllabic	Per cent Monosyllabic	Per cent Dissyllabic
Essay on Criticism......	94.91	74.83	20.09
The Rape of the Lock...	94.71	74.59	20.12
Elegy—Unfortunate Lady	95.86	77.15	18.71
Essay on Man I......	94.32	75.26	19.06
II......	94.32	73.39	20.93
III......	94.43	75.57	18.86
IV......	95.54	76.98	18.56
Total..............	94.72	75.45	19.27
Epistle to Dr. Arbuthnot	95.91	77.66	18.25

TABLE IX.

TENNYSON	Total per cent Mono-dissyllabic	Per cent Monosyllabic	Per cent Dissyllabic
Oenone................	94.31	71.43	22.88
Ulysses................	96.94	79.32	17.62
Tithonus................	96.33	78.14	18.19
The Coming of Arthur...	96.54	81.08	15.46
Merlin and Vivien......	95.88	79.69	16.19
Lancelot and Elaine.....	95.83	81.46	14.37
The Holy Grail.........	96.48	80.39	16.09
Guinevere..............	95.68	81.28	14.40
The Passing of Arthur...	96.59	81.42	15.17

TABLE X.

SWINBURNE	Total per cent Mono-dissyllabic	Per cent Monosyllabic	Per cent Dissyllabic
Chastelard I..........	98.59	89.13	9.46
II..........	98.56	89.18	9.38
III..........	98.65	90.17	8.48
IV..........	98.30	90.22	8.08
V..........	98.18	88.57	9.61
Total..............	98.42	89.46	8.96
Atalanta in Calydon			
Dialogue.............	95.84	82.48	13.36
Choruses.............	96.83	81.50	15.33
Total..............	96.14	82.19	13.95
Hymn to Proserpine.....	97.50	82.35	15.15
Hesperia...............	97.03	81.76	15.27
The Forsaken Garden...	98.80	84.05	14.75